

Wojciech Cichosz

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0839-2179>

Anthropological determinants of religious education

Summary

DEFINITION OF THE TERM: Anthropology as a scientific discipline investigates man in a holistic and integral way. This holistic approach allows researchers to identify and harmonize the biological elements of human existence with the cultural determinants in which man is born and brought up and in which he co-creates culture.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TERM: The term “anthropology” was used for the first time in M. Hundert’s work *Anthropologium de hominis dignitate, natura et proprietatibus* (1501). As a scientific discipline, anthropology emerged at the end of the 18th century. Initially, it was limited to the classification of the human races (F. Bernier in the 17th century, K.R. Darwin in 1871, E. Dubois in 1892). In Poland, the development of anthropology began in the 19th century with works by W. Surowiecki, J. Majer, and I. Kopernicki. In the 20th century its development was continued by K. Stolyhwo, J. Czekanowski, J. Mydlarski, and E. Loth. S. Kunowski played a significant role in the development of anthropology in the area of education, including religious education.

DISCUSSION OF THE TERM: In the analysis of the anthropological determinants of religious education it is important to distinguish between various ways of understanding anthropology, which can be divided into physical, philosophical, cultural, biblical, religious, and social anthropology. In education today, despite the prevalence of a reductionist approach to man, a more holistic approach to anthropology seems to prevail.

SYSTEMATIC REFLECTION WITH CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: Religious education makes significant use of anthropology,

as both sciences are interested in the diverse determinants of man – both the limitations and the possibilities. Therefore, religious education postulates the need to recognize and develop such abilities as *bios* (biological potential, headed by temperament and character), *agos* (educational environment), *ethos* (the value system), *logos* (critical and sober thinking), as well as recognising the *fate* of man (his inevitability, eschatology). Religious education perceives a person in a broad anthropological context, starting from the existential 'I am' (in Latin: *sum*) and heading towards a dynamic 'I become' (in Latin: *sursum* – up, above). Religion acquires particular significance in educational processes, as it facilitates the discovery of the meaning of life and directs a person towards Transcendence. On this path, the educational process is oriented towards the religious dimension and the hierarchy of values: from temporal goods, through spiritual goods, to absolute goods.

Keywords: anthropology, *bios*, *agos*, *ethos*, *logos*, fate, religious education

What is involved in raising children? In answering this question two fundamental truths should be kept in mind: first, that man is called to live in truth and love; and second, that everyone finds fulfilment through the sincere gift of self. This is true both for the educator and for the one being educated. Education is thus a unique process for which the mutual communion of persons has immense importance. The educator is a person who “begets” in a spiritual sense. From this point of view, raising children can be considered a genuine apostolate. It is a living means of communication which not only creates a profound relationship between the educator and the one being educated, but also makes them both sharers in truth and love, that final goal to which everyone is called by God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (John Paul II, 1994, 16).

In the context of the above, it can be clearly stated that education and anthropology point to the same reality (Bagrowicz, 2000). Both are interested in man and his many determinants, developmental opportunities, and limitations, both internal (in Latin: *ad intra*) and external (in Latin: *ad extra*). In order to understand the mutual relationship between religious education and anthropology, the terminological semiotics must first be discussed.

Definition of the term

According to the *Encyclopaedia*, anthropology (in Greek: ἄνθρωπος, *anthropos* – man, λόγος, *logos* – science, word) is “a monographic scientific discipline addressing the holistic description of man as both a biological species and a creator of culture. In Poland, anthropology is primarily understood as physical anthropology (comparative human biology)” (Rawicz, 2005, p. 443). By approaching anthropological thought holistically, it is possible to point to its numerous fundamental branches.

Biblical anthropology is understood as the set of views on human nature and fate that is presented in the Bible. It forms the basis of Christian anthropology. In biblical theology, man is understood in relation to God. He was created by God (in God’s image), he lives under his protection (Divine providence), and – redeemed from sin (the mystery of Jesus’ incarnation) – he goes back to God (eschatology). This concept presupposes the unity of man (and not the dualism of body and soul), and the terms body (in Greek: σαρξ, *sarx* or σώμα, *sōma*), soul (in Greek: ψυχή, *psychē*), and spirit (in Greek: πνεῦμα, *pneuma*) relate to different aspects or functions, and not to parts of man.

Philosophical anthropology is a branch of philosophy that is interested in man. The term "anthropology" was used in the philosophical sense for the first time in 1596 by Otto Casmann, for whom it was the study of the duality of human nature. M. Scheler introduced the term "philosophical anthropology" in the 20th century. The concept of a human being forms the basis of philosophical anthropology. It focuses primarily on the distinguishing features of man (his being a rational creature, his activity in a spiritual or material sense, his ability to think abstractly and speak, and his ability to experience higher feelings).

Cultural anthropology, which is one of the basic fields of the anthropological sciences, is included in the group of social and/or cultural sciences. It examines the organization of culture, the laws that govern it, the meaning and functions of its individual elements, as well as the historical variability and ethnic diversity of cultures. Cultural anthropology, which has developed mainly in the USA, has become the American equivalent of British social anthropology and European ethnology. With time, the term also became popular outside of the United States (e.g. in Poland) and now denotes cultural studies conducted in the place of former ethnographic and ethnological research.

Religious anthropology is also understood as part of a religious doctrine. It is a general human theory contained in holy books, myths, and rituals. It is usually not treated as a separate or distinct complex form of beliefs, but as an integral part of all beliefs about reality. It is knowledge about man, contained in religion, particularly focused on his origins, the nature of his body and spirit, and the meaning of life.

Social anthropology (a discipline within social sciences) deals with man as a social being who operates in his own cultural environment. Broadly understood, it can be said that it is the equivalent to American cultural anthropology and European ethnology. Nowadays, it aims to formulate a general theory of society by making a qualitative analysis of small social groups, conducted mainly by means of intensive field research among 'exotic' peoples, as well as within industrial societies. The central research category of social anthropology is a system of social relationships, in the context of which it analyses cultural phenomena such as patterns, values, institutions, customs, symbols, etc. The interests of social anthropology focus on the relationship between social facts and cultural phenomena.

Historical analysis of the term

Science, as a phenomenon, is primarily a historical process, which means it is not possible to grasp fully the meaning of today's achievements in anthropology and religious education without knowing what preceded them. Although science has changed significantly over the centuries, it has retained its genetic identity, i.e. the close relationship between its successive states and its functional identity, i.e. the constancy of the fundamental role it has played in culture. The term 'anthropology' appeared in the subject literature for the first time in 1501 in M. Hundert's work *Anthropologium de hominis dignitate, natura et proprietatibus* (Rawicz, 2005, p. 444). At the end of the 18th century, anthropology became an independent scientific discipline that initially investigated the classification of the human races (F. Bernier, K.R. Darwin, E. Dubois). In the 19th century, it also began to develop in Poland, mainly thanks to the work of W. Surowiecki, J. Majer, and I. Kopernicki. This was continued in the 20th century by K. Stołyhwo, J. Czekanowski, J. Mydlarski, E. Loth, and – in the field of education, including religious education – by S. Kunowski. The common denominator of anthropological research is an attempt to answer the fundamental questions "Who am I?", "Me, a man?"

Western concepts of man from the perspective of philosophical and theological anthropology

Western culture offers two approaches to human existence (Kloskowski, 1995). The first is associated with Plato's views, according to which man is a soul that makes use of a body, while the second is associated with Aristotle's philosophy, for which man is the unity of two factors connected by existence: the material body and the immaterial soul. For Plato, sensual perceptions are an attribute of the soul, but they are also a property of the body. This is why it must be assumed that the soul is united with the body because it moves the body (it is its mover). Aristotle understood man as an entity composed of matter and form. According to him, it is the form that constitutes the soul because it is an act of the body that has life in potentiality. Matter, on the other hand, gives

numerical identity to form (matter is designated by quantity – *matter quantitate signata*). What is more, man is a rational being, so the following thesis can be put forward: you are not a man just because you have been assigned to the animal world but because you possess reason. Hence, not every animal is a human being, although every human being is an animal. It is this ability to reason that makes a human being (Cichosz, 2000).

Until the 17th century, the above anthropological concepts were modified according to the prevailing spiritual-psychological or natural perspective. For example, the Stoics and the Epicureans interpreted the definition of man proposed by Aristotle within Democritus' materialism. Later, thanks to St. Augustine, the concepts of Plato dominated until the 13th century. The starting point for St. Augustine's proposal was the observation that man realizes himself through his acts, cognition, and creativity, and not through an abstract and static Aristotelian vision of the world. Hence, the conviction that man is capable of self-knowledge and self-reflection. This led St. Augustine to the conclusion that man is an entity composed of both body and soul (as separate entities, neither the soul nor the body comprise a human being), which is the concept of *compositum humanum*. However, it should be remembered that in this unity of body and soul it is the soul that guides the body.

It is difficult not to agree with M. Krapiec's opinion that

in Christian culture, the method of Saint Augustine was followed by those who were especially interested in man's inner life, (...) his inner attitude to God. Hence, the mystics of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance are closer to Saint Augustine's thoughts than Aristotle's (...). And after Descartes' philosophy of the subject had been constituted, the analysis of the contents of consciousness clearly began to prevail over Aristotle's objective method. On the one hand, this led to numerous misunderstandings and obvious errors, in e.g. Descartes himself, Hume, Kant, Hegel, and the existentialists, but, on the other hand, it offered an opportunity to look at man from a fresh perspective and notice his uniqueness in nature, as B. Pascal, J. Newman, M. Heidegger, and M. Scheler did (Krapiec, 1980, p. 27; Pascal, 1989).

In the 11th century, an attempt to combine the metaphysics of Aristotle with Neoplatonism was made by Avicenna. This Persian physician described man as a social, culturally creative creature that uses articulated language and differs from animals in that he experiences morality,

i.e. he recognizes and experiences what is righteous or unrighteous. For him, man was also a creature who predicts his future.

Outlining the history of anthropological thought, it is impossible to omit the philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas, who, referring to Aristotle's proposal, gives a new dimension to the theory of man by introducing the concept of the soul as a form of the body. Consequently, Aquinas' approach (in contrast to the Platonic approach) emphasises the interdependence of both the mental and material processes in human nature. Moreover, St. Thomas also rejects the materialistic approaches (e.g. Democritus' view). For him, man is not a conglomerate or a mixture of the material body and the immaterial soul: he is an organic psychophysical whole.

A review of the philosophical perspectives clearly demonstrates that some thinkers link their concepts to Aristotle, whilst others to Plato. For example, in the 15th century Cajetan was inspired by Aristotle, while Descartes (the great mind of modernity) was fascinated by Platonism and laid the foundations of the philosophy of the subject, in which man is the centre of everything. This theory was later developed by B. Spinoza, N. Malebranche, and G.W. Leibniz, amongst others. It is worth emphasising that under the influence of Descartes, Plato's reflections on man began to dominate, which justifies M.A. Krąpiec's thesis (Krąpiec, 1979) that Descartes is a borderline figure between the ancient-medieval and modern-contemporary approaches to anthropological issues. The main assumption that a human being occupies a specific place in the overall picture of the world was replaced by the assumption that this position is occupied by clear and distinct human thought (in Latin: *cogito ergo sum* – I think, therefore I am). This idea has become the decisive factor that determines the accuracy of reflections on man in post-Cartesian rationalism; it is based on the philosophy of the human subject who fulfils the Sophistic postulate of Protagoras, according to which man is the measure of all things (in Greek: πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος, *pantōn chrēmātōn metron anthrōpos*). According to Descartes, a person consists of an extended body and an immaterial soul. Of course, this view undermines the idea that the soul and the body have a direct and mutual influence on each other. In his opinion, the spiritual substance (soul) is characterized by reason and will, which consequently leads to the conclusion that thinking is the essence of humanity – *cogito ergo sum*.

This moment of human existence is perceived in a completely different way by B. Pascal, for whom man "is only a reed, the most feeble in nature; but this is a thinking reed" (Pascal, 1977, p. 112). "It is not from space that I must seek my dignity, but from the government of my thought. I shall have no more if I possess worlds. By space the universe encompasses and swallows me up like an atom; by thought I comprehend the world" (Pascal, 1977, p. 113). Pascal was convinced that human thought was limited. This led him to distinguishing between the order of the heart and the order of reason, each of which is characteristic of itself.

I. Kant played an extremely important role in anthropological thought. In his philosophy, the essence of human nature is created by personality. Thanks to its moral value, which is expressed by understanding and distinguishing between good and evil, it allows man to transcend the reality around him and to justify his actions rationally (Kant, 1986). This moral personality is characterized by freedom, autonomy of action, and the possibility of self-improvement. Kant's famous maxim is still known today: "the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me" (in German: *Der gestirnte Himmel über mir und das moralische Gesetz in mir*).

G.W.F. Hegel approached the concept of man from a totally different perspective. Based on rationalistic and dialectic approaches, he concluded that the primary source of reality is *Logos*, understood as an Absolute Idea that transforms itself in a dialectic way, first creating nature and then the human spirit. Consequently, man is a stage in the formation of *Logos*.

S.A. Kierkegaard, amongst others, opposed this view of man. According to him, man is a creature capable of self-reflection. The status of human existence consists in the necessity of constant choices between good and evil, God and the world. He views human nature in the context of life's attitudes, in sensitivity to the system of values, as well as responsibility for one's own life (Kierkegaard, 1969). Another existentialist, G. Marcel, emphasises that man is a specifically existing "I". He does not identify this "I" with the body, although it is related to it. Human nature is subjective. Man has acquired awareness of his own existence and of other people. The attitude that man takes towards others leads him to discover the existence of God (Marcel, 1965; Kowalczyk, 1972; Ratajczak, 1971).

The above claim was decisively rejected by Jean-Paul Sartre, who was convinced that in the relationship between man and God it is God who determines the actions that are proper for man. Thus, Sartre proclaimed, "Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself" (Sartre, 1946, p. 22). Moreover, speaking of man, he questions the autonomy of the human condition, saying "Hell is other people". He writes:

In a special way, I am consciousness of freedom, since there is nothing in consciousness except non-positional consciousness of its existence. Thus, my freedom is constantly entangled in my being, it is not an additional quality or value of my nature, it is literally the material of my being (Sartre, 1948, p. 514).

It is precisely this consciousness that leads man to the nothingness that surrounds him, which he can overcome through free and responsible action.

A short presentation of the history of anthropological thought reveals a complex array of views. However, in order to offer a complete picture, Marxism, which proposed a completely different view of man, must also be mentioned. Before doing so, it is worth mentioning the philosophy of A. Comte and the neopositivists (Comte, 1973), who define man solely in social terms. According to them, the primary reality is not the individual but society. An individual has by his very nature been subordinated to social life, and in this he finds the realization of his needs. Thus, A. Comte and his successors do not take into account the spiritual dimension of man at all. According to their concept, only what can be justified and proved empirically and sociologically should be taken into account.

In the above philosophical climate, it is easier to discover the intentions of the co-creators of dialectical materialism, K. Marx, F.K. Engels, and W.I. Lenin (Jaroszewski, 1978), who present human existence as thinking matter. In this anthropological view, human consciousness, conscience, and culture are matter or are the products of matter. Thinking itself is a function of the brain, which is the product of matter (materialistic monism). It should be noted that Marxism is not homogeneous. Some of its representatives emphasize that man has the right to freedom because he is internally free, or the right to "dispositional property", i.e. the freedom of choice (Fritzhand, 1986), while others undermine freedom as an objective fact (in this perspective, man can experience freedom only subjectively) (Krajewski, 1959). According to

materialistic philosophy, human existence is the result of a combination of socialization processes and is secondary and derivative (Ślipko, 1967). Marx writes, “the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of social relations” (Marks, 1961, p. 7). Although there are many different versions of Marxist anthropology, they share a common view of man which can be described as:

- a natural and social being;
- a being with a consciousness (psyche) that allows him to understand his environment and to direct his actions;
- a creature who produces tools for work;
- a being who develops himself through work in society and for society (a collective) (Stępień, 1987).

A similar spirit accompanies C. Lévi-Strauss’s philosophy, who, using structural linguistics (Lévi-Strauss, 1969), perceives man as a fragment of nature, thus reducing a human being to the biological-physical sphere. He questions human freedom and the individual human “self”. According to Strauss’s theory, these properties are merely the interiorization of language. Human mental life is defined as a function of unconscious matter. He writes, “Man is a machine, more perfect perhaps than others, which is working at the dissolution of an original order and hence reducing organized matter to a state of inertia which one day will be final” (Lévi-Strauss, 1964, pp. 382–283).

Such a pessimistic vision of man is strongly questioned by Christian philosophy (e.g. personalism or phenomenology). This philosophy goes beyond negating and rejecting sciences that are “alien” to it, but creatively seeks grounds for the reconciliation of opposing views, e.g. contemporary evolutionism and creationism. One of the numerous Catholic philosophers of the 20th century, P. Teilhard de Chardin, states that the appearance of a creature such as man is the result of God’s activity and the processes of evolution, and this defines man as a particle of life. It is a unifying activity consisting of the centralization (spiritual sphere) of scattered and unrelated (material sphere) elements. In his opinion, the integration of particular elements causes their transformation, which leads to the formation of beings with an increasing degree of “being”, including man. Therefore, human existence is a product of the process of evolution and, at the same time, its creative factor on a social level. Man

is simply a being who possesses a set of qualities revealed in evolution (Teilhard de Chardin, 1976; 1984).

Based on the above anthropological analyses, it can be concluded that there are as many views as there are thinkers. However, their views constitute a significant basis for understanding and developing religious education. Looking at philosophical anthropology over the centuries, one can imagine three basic anthropological concepts or combinations of the matter-spirit relationship:

- materialistic, which sees human beings merely as matter – an animal written into the curvature of space-time. It thus encloses man in the circle of matter and the temporal, and it deprives his life of ultimate and timeless meaning;
- idealistic, which identifies the human being as a “perfect spirit”; man is an unhappy angel entangled in a material body that disturbs and enslaves, from which he wishes to free himself, but this is something he cannot do;
- realistic, which perceives and interprets man as a bodily-spiritual unity; in this way, it harmonizes and combines the first two.

Classification

The most important anthropological question in the above theories and views on man seems to be the following: is man really a special kind of being, a unique individual in the reality surrounding him (Marek and Walulik, 2019)? Maybe he is merely a specific natural object shaped according to the mechanisms of the functioning of matter. The abundant subject literature devoted to this issue makes it possible to systematize anthropological knowledge in the following way:

- monistic concepts: man is constituted by one fundamental component (extreme spiritualism: man is a non-corporeal being; extreme materialism: man is only the body; moderate spiritualism: the bodily element is a derivative of the spiritual element; moderate materialism: the spiritual element is secondary to the body)
- dualistic concepts: man is an entity composed of two equivalent but different components: the body and the soul. These concepts include neutralism, identism, and hylomorphism (neutralism: man

is shaped by one principle which – as a consequence of distinguishing between the body and soul – becomes meaningless because man is neither material nor spiritual; identism: corporeality and spirituality are two sides of the same man; hylomorphism: man consists of a body, that is prime matter, and an immaterial soul, that is substantial form).

The methodological classification presented above is necessarily a simplification, but it systematizes knowledge and offers a convenient starting point for understanding the anthropological determinants of religious education.

Discussion of the term

Religious education, which describes the process of teaching and learning based on religious sources, can be described as the “cultivation of man”, modelled on the classical “cultivation of culture” (in Greek: *πέλομαι*, *pelomai*; in Latin *colĕre*, *culture*) and an inner effort to transform the sphere of the human spirit. This task was entrusted to man, as the Bible states, by God himself at the moment of creation: “Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground” (Genesis 1:28). Thus, it is man’s rational and unrestricted shaping of himself and the world in its spiritual, material, and civilizational dimensions (Rahner and Vorgrimler, 1996). Man, being an entity composed of the material (body) and the spiritual (soul) dimensions, realizes them in contact with the world and other personal entities, taking appropriate actions according to his own capabilities. Only in the presence of “the Other” does man acquire an opportunity to develop and reveal his capabilities, even if only in the biological dimension (Kra̧piec, 1987). This need directs man towards creating various types of relationships within the family, friendship, religion, and the state. Within this interdependence, he perfects and develops his own abilities for the benefit of himself and the community to which he belongs. Through education, man becomes more human and more humane.

S. Kunowski proposed an interesting concept based on the pedagogical theories of W. Flitner and S. Hessen. His original tiered approach

(Dziaczkowska, 2018) to the process of education covers the essential anthropological components: bios, ethos, agos, fate, and logos. S. Kunowski's theory can be succinctly explained as the integration of all educational activities in which Christ is placed at the centre (Szamocki, 2001). Kunowski notes that human upbringing requires the development of bios, ethos, and agos. He also takes into account fate as a factor that shapes a person and indicates the need for the students' cooperation, which is essential in the process of effective upbringing.

Bios

Kunowski considers bios (in Greek: βίος, *bios* – life, state of nature) to be the most natural and basic educational force, which is the life drive of an organism's spontaneous mental development. It results from its biological inheritance (from parents, close and distant ancestors), which runs independently of its will and is "shaped by the state of the biological vigour of several genealogical generations, as the natural psycho-organic development of each individual" (Kunowski, 2004). It constitutes "a fundamental dynamic force, which is the driving force behind the entire educational process" (Kunowski, 2004, p. 172). Temperament, which is given to man, plays an important role here (sanguine, choleric, phlegmatic, or melancholic), as does personality, which in turn is given to him as a task to be achieved (mature, coherent, transparent, and congruent). Personality (acquired throughout an entire life and relatively stable) is a person's unique way of thinking, acting, and feeling. It is not the same as temperament (e.g. calmness and composure or rashness), which is an inborn and purely biological characteristic of a person. Character should also be mentioned here in relation to the moral and ethical determinants of human behaviour (e.g. honesty, politeness, or truthfulness). Both temperament and character form essential parts of personality (its fixed and variable elements). In this context, the *Serenity Prayer* becomes truly meaningful: "God, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference".

Ethos

For centuries, the natural life drive of an organism has been included in the norms and customs of the societies in which the individual is born and develops. Man's upbringing is influenced by the customs and the morality of a particular social group. By influencing the bios of a human being through various methods (e.g. through coercion, pressure, social opinion, legal sanctions, control, etc.), they influence the formation of desired attitudes (the educational ideal). In pedagogy, these activities are called ethos (in Greek: ἦθος, *ēthos* – custom, habit, the culture and the value system). Habit is formed in a student because of the consistent expectations and attitudes voiced by various social groups (family, peer groups, professional groups, school, and community); it leads to imitation and to a sense of duty to solidarize with the promoted and recognised norms and practices. As a result of the effects of ethos in various areas of life, “social or cultural inheritance, much more important for human development than biological” takes place in upbringing (Kunowski, 2004, p. 173). Ethos, i.e. the influence adult members of society exert on the younger generation through various methods and means (speech, writing, pictures, media, etc.), enables the natural development of children and youth in accordance with the expectations of a given social group in terms of the customs and moral norms represented by that community. This process socialises the individual according to the ideals promoted by the group. However, it can be disturbed if a pupil is subjected to the influence of groups guided by principles commonly regarded as immoral or incompatible with humanistic ideals (gangs, subcultures, etc.). In order to prevent such disturbances, it becomes necessary to take corrective (reacting) and preventive (permanent prevention through information) measures on an ongoing basis.

Agos

The success of upbringing is determined not only by bios and ethos but by the third force of upbringing: agos (in Greek: ἄγως, *agōs* – leading). It covers the aforementioned correctional efforts that are undertaken by experienced educators, whose aim is to achieve noble patterns that

enable a student to come closer to the ideal of comprehensive development. The result of such activities is the transformation of a student and, consequently, of entire societies. The power of this moral and mental influence exerted by educators is described by Kunowski as *agos*. Depending on its strength, it is possible for a student to attempt to rise “above the drives of his bios and above the average of the group ethos” (Kunowski, 2004, p. 175). Thus, the teacher’s guidance (*agos*) contributes to the student’s personal development.

Fate

Another factor that influences the educational process is fate. According to Kunowski, this is the most unpredictable and mysterious element, and “although it is an immeasurable and unpredictable force, it decisively influences the life, development and upbringing of every person with its frowns or smiles of fortune” (Kunowski, 2004, p. 175). Therefore, it becomes necessary to consider it in the theory of upbringing, as it is additionally confirmed by various analyses. Fate-Absolute can be viewed fatalistically (in Greek: *μοῖρα*, *moira*, unrelenting fate), deterministically (in Latin: *naturum parendo vincitur* – Bacon; when it is believed that man can influence his own fate by submitting to the laws of nature), or indeterministically (when fate is analysed from the perspective of pure chance which faces man with the necessity of constant choice; “existence precedes essence” – J.-P. Sartre’s existentialism). These views indicate the superiority of fate over human choices and decisions. The Christian view of fate, in which it is not an absolute, indicates a different perspective.

Logos

From the perspective of Christian faith, man’s path in life is marked out by freedom, grace, and fate, all of which are contained in God’s providence. This concept includes both destiny (in Greek: *ἀνάγκη*, *anankē*, in Latin: *necessitas* – need, necessity, absolute compulsion, compelling force, inevitability) and irreversibility (death, judgment, sin, and

punishment), but also the vocation of the freedom of man endowed by the Creator with grace (in Latin: *vocatio*). A Christian's action should take the form of an active attitude towards fate, based on a belief in the power of prayer, a scientific approach to nature, knowledge of human history and the laws that govern communities, and a belief in God's wisdom and glory, which are all called Logos (in Greek: λόγος, *logos* – word, science). From the perspective of upbringing, the term “encounter” is of great importance, as from a human perspective it is seen as establishing contact with someone who will be able to point out the right direction of development, reveal valuable goals, teach the student how to take up various challenges and solve problems, and be a master for him. In the context of faith, it is the establishment of a close relationship with the Creator, whose guidance directs us towards other people (Kunowski, 2004; Marek, 2017).

The stages listed above require careful and prudent examination. Omitting any of them disturbs the process of upbringing and leads to undesirable consequences in the development and functioning of man in all spheres of his activity.

Systematic reflection with conclusions and recommendations

Although much has already been done in various areas of human life, man (in Greek: ἄνθρωπος, *anthropos*) remains an impenetrable mystery. Contemporary religious and cultural transformations of a global and civilizational scope seem to be extinguishing efforts that are aimed at the development of religious education (Cichosz, 2001). The above considerations should be viewed through the prism of the continuous relationship between man (creation) and God (Creator). Thus, in religious education and Christian formation, we can speak of taking man out of *bios* through *ethos*, *agos*, and fate, to the Divine *Logos* (Cichosz, 2010), i.e. to the full realization of the vocation of the human person in God. In this way, man does not discover his existence only in the perspective of the Latin *sum* (static “I am”), but *sursum* (relational, dynamic “upwards”), i.e. he grows more and more, higher and higher, and stronger and stronger (Marek, 2014).

Christian anthropology is always based on investigating the concept of man within theology and personalistic philosophy (Bilicki, 2007; Chrobak, 1999). The resulting thesis is that every human being, by virtue of his ontological constitution, is the person (in Greek *πρόσωπον*, *prosōpon*; in Latin *persona*) (Cichosz, 2001). Following É. Gilson's considerations (Gilson, 1966), the most representative definition of a person seems to be the one given by Boethius (Anicius Manlius Severinus Boëthius), a Roman philosopher, politician, and the medieval translator of Aristotle, who wrote that *persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia* (Boethius, 1927, p. 229): "a person is an individual substance of a rational nature". Nature is understood here as a significant specified property of any substance. This definition, frequently analysed by St. Thomas Aquinas, led him to the conclusion that the person is what is most perfect in all nature (in Latin: *persona significat id, quod est perfectissimum in tota rerum natura*). Man, although made up of numerous elements, is not a 'mix' of an animal and an angel. As the most perfect being in the material world, he is not a mosaic, a set of different elements (e.g. matter and form, soul and body), but always an inseparable whole. What is more, he possesses extraordinary dignity, which in theology is elevated to being the "child of God" (cf. Romans 8:14–15, 18–19, 26–27; Galatians 4:6–7; 1 John 3:1). In the Book of Genesis we read:

So God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them. God blessed them and said to them, "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground" (Genesis 1:27–28).

The greatness and dignity of God's child must be constantly known, protected, developed, and communicated (a gift and a task). The formation of a young person should lead to his full inclusion in society: he should become a person who is positively formed, responsible, and committed to building the Kingdom of God on earth.

In biblical thought, man as a bodily and spiritual being always constitutes an integral unity. The Creator of man is the One who has given a human being a personal shape. This is not about external appearance but about the internal structure that distinguishes him from other creatures and elevates him above them (Cichosz, 2019). The Bible is the

place and source where one must seek basic information about man's nature: who he is, where he came from, and where he is heading. It clearly indicates the essential elements of the harmony of human complexity (in Latin: *compositum humanum*). It is worth recalling the Hebrew biblical terms used in the Old Testament: *nefeš* – soul (Septuagint: ψυχή – *psychē*; Vulgate: *anima*), *bāsār* – body (Septuagint: σάρξ – *sarks*, σωμα – *sōma*; Vulgate: *corpus*), *rûah* – wind, life-giving breath (Septuagint: πνεῦμα – *pneuma*; Vulgate: *spiritus*), *lēbāb* [*lēb*] – heart (Septuagint: καρδιά – *cardia*; Vulgate: *cor*) (Cichosz, 2010). Although the above concepts are ambiguous, it is important to remember that they influence one another. In listing various human 'organs', the Old Testament does not treat them as parts of a human being but always as functional manifestations of a human life. This ability to view human existence in a holistic and relational way is an original feature of the biblical way of thinking (Cichosz, 2019). This is confirmed by the words of Psalm 8: "What is mankind that you are mindful of them, human beings that you care for them? You have made them a little lower than angels and crowned them with glory and honour. You made them rulers over the works of your hands; you put everything under their feet" (Psalm 8:4–6).

Such a great distinction given to man by God (the work of creation) obliges man to live according to God's commands and to study and proclaim His word. Analysis of Old Testament terms that describe a human being and human life leads I. Mroczkowski to the following statement:

The meaning of none of the words that define a human being is separate from others in a radical way. Judaic anthropology is monistic in the sense that man is seen as a living whole (...). Each of the words that define man expresses the whole of human existence from different points of view. 'Bāsār' expresses the outer figure, 'nefeš' expresses life force, while 'rûah' is the creative force that comes from God (Mroczkowski, 1994, p. 104).

In Christian anthropological thought, man is understood as a corporeal and spiritual being that constitutes an integral and harmonious unity (Cichosz, 2019). In its anthropological inclination, religious education always points to the horizontal primary source, path, and goal that is man, and the vertical primary source, path, and goal that is God. Moreover, man – understood as a person who, in upbringing, connects the earthly world with the supernatural world – is the subject and object of action.

The purpose of education is to integrate all spheres of human life, thus upbringing should be based on Divine grace, human reason, and objective axiology. Upbringing begins in the community, takes place in the community and for the community, and heads towards the ultimate goal in eternity.

REFERENCES

- Bagrowicz, J. (2000). *Edukacja religijna współczesnej młodzieży. Źródła i cele*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Bilicki, T. (2007). *Dziecko i wychowanie w pedagogii Jana Pawła II. Na podstawie jego encyklik, adhortacji, wybranych listów i przemówień*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls".
- Boecjusz, A.M.S. (1927). *O pociechach filozofii ksiąg pięcioro oraz traktaty teologiczne*. Trans. T. Jachimowski. Poznań: Fiszer i Majewski – Księgarnia Uniwersytecka.
- Chrobak, S. (1999). *Koncepcja wychowania personalistycznego w nauczaniu Karola Wojtyły – Jana Pawła II*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie.
- Cichosz, W. (2000). *Metodologia. Elementarz Studenta*. Gdańsk: Zakłady Graficzne im. KEN.
- Cichosz, W. (2001). *Wychowanie chrześcijańskie wobec postmodernistycznej prowokacji*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Zakłady Graficzne im. KEN S.A.
- Cichosz, W. (2010). *Pedagogia wiary we współczesnej szkole katolickiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Typo2.
- Cichosz, W. (2019). *Wychowanie integralne. Praktyczna recepcja gimnazjum w Zespole Szkół Katolickich im. św. Jana Pawła II w Gdyni. 1992–2019*. Pelplin: Bernardinum.
- Comte, A. (1973). *Rozprawa o duchu filozofii pozytywnej. Rozprawa o całości kształcie pozytywizmu*. Ed. B. Skarga, trans. J. Krajewski, B. Skarga, W. Wojciechowska. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Dziachkowska, L. (2018). Podstawy współczesnej pedagogiki Stefana Kunowskiego jako przykład kreowania pedagogiki ogólnej. *Forum Pedagogiczne*, 1, 59–69.
- Fritzhand, M. (1986). Marksizm a wolność i odpowiedzialność. In: M. Drużkowski and K. Sokół (ed.), *Antynomie wolności*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 460–498.

- Gilson, É. (1966). *Historia filozofii chrześcijańskiej w wiekach średnich*. Trans. S. Zalewski. Warszawa: Pax.
- Jan Paweł II (1994). *List do rodzin "Gratissimam sane"*. Rzym.
- Jaroszewski, T.M. (1978). Marksistowska koncepcja człowieka. Humanizm socjalistyczny i perspektywy komunizmu. In: J. Grudzień et al. (ed.), *Filozofia marksistowska. Podręcznik akademicki do przedmiotu Podstawy marksistowsko-leninowskiej filozofii i socjologii*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 669–723.
- Kant, I. (1986). *Krytyka czystego rozumu*. Vol. 1 i 2. Trans. R. Ingarden. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1969). *Bojaźń i drżenie. Choroba na śmierć*. Trans. J. Iwaszkiewicz. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kloskowski, K. (1995). *Bioetyczne aspekty inżynierii genetycznej. Wybrane problemy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Teologii Katolickiej.
- Kowalczyk, S. (1972). Charakter teizmu Gabriela Marcela. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 1, 37–48.
- Krajewski, W. (1959). *Ontologia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Krąpiec, M. (1987). *Kim jest człowiek?*. Warszawa: Studium Kultury Chrześcijańskiej.
- Krąpiec, M.A. (1979). *Ja – człowiek. Zarys antropologii filozoficznej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Krąpiec, M.A. (1980). Człowiek – suwerenny byt osobowy – w ujęciu Karola Wojtyły (na marginesie "Osoby i czynu"). In: B. Bejze (ed.), *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*. Vol. 12: *Być człowiekiem i chrześcijaninem*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, 25–34.
- Kunowski, S. (2004). *Podstawy współczesnej pedagogiki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1964). *Smutek tropików*. Trans. A. Steinberg. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1969). *Myśl nieoswojona*. Trans. A. Zajązkowski. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Marcel, G. (1965). *Od sprzeciwu do wezwania*. Trans. S. Ławicki. Warszawa: Pax.
- Marek, Z. (2014). *Religia – pomoc czy zagrożenie dla edukacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM.
- Marek, Z. (2017). *Pedagogika towarzyszenia. Perspektywa tradycji ignacjańskiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Ignatianum.
- Marek, Z. and Walulik, A. (2019). *Pedagogika świadectwa. Perspektywa antropologiczno-kerygmaticzna*. Kraków: Akademia "Ignatianum".
- Marks, K. (1961). Tezy o Feuerbachu. In: K. Marks and F. Engels. *Dzieła*. Vol. 3. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 5–8.

- Mroczkowski, I. (1994). *Osoba i cielesność. Moralne aspekty teologii ciała*. Płock: Płockie Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne.
- Pascal, B. (1977). *Myśli*. Trans. T. Żeleński (Boy). Warszawa: Pax.
- Pascal, B. (1989). *Myśli, w układzie Jacquesa Chevaliera*. Trans. T. Boy-Żeleński. Warszawa: Pax.
- Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych*. Poznań-Warszawa 1990.
- Rahner, K. and Vorgrimler, H. (1996). *Mały słownik teologiczny*. Warszawa: Pax.
- Ratajczak, M. (1971). Otwarcie się na "Ty" absolutne według Gabriela Marcela. *Colloquium Salutis. Wrocławskie Studia Teologiczne*, 3, 149–163.
- Rawicz, J. (at al.) (2005). *Encyklopedia*. Vol. 1: A-Aykro. Kraków: Agora S.A.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1994). *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1996). *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Stępień, A.B. (1987). Wobec marksistowskiej teorii człowieka. In: A.B. Stępień (ed.), *Wobec filozofii marksistowskiej. Polskie doświadczenia*. Rzym: Fundacja Jana Pawła II. Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej, 61–89.
- Szamocki, G. (2001). *Motyw bramy w Nowym Testamencie. Przyczynek do teologii biblijnej*. Pelplin: Bernardinum.
- Ślipko, T. (1967). Pojęcie człowieka w świetle współczesnej filozoficznej antropologii marksistowskiej w Polsce. *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL*, no. 2, 3–16.
- Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1976). *Écrits du temps de la guerre. 1916–1919*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1984). *Pisma*. Vol. I: *Człowiek i inne pisma*. Trans. J. Karczmarewicz-Fedorowska, G. Fedorowski. Warszawa: Pax.